

ORIGIN/ACTION

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

EUR-6

AIRGRAM

DEF 12 US
XR DEF 1-5 US
FOR RM USE ONLY

M/R	REP	AF
1		
RA	EUR	AF
		4
IEA	CU	INR
7		5
E	P	IO
	2	5
L	FBO	AID
17	GPM	4AL
	2	1
AGR		
5/5	10	1
INT	LAB	TAR
TR		AIR
3	10	5
RMY	CIA	NAVY
3	10	5
OSD	USIA	NSA
4	10	3
EC	NSC	ACDA
8	6	17

CA-7841

CONFIDENTIAL

NO.

HANDLING INDICATOR

TO : USMISSION NATO; All NATO Capitals; USCINCEUR, Vaihingen (For POLAD); CINCUSNAVEUR, London; SHAPE, Brussels (for POLAD); USDOCOSOUTH, Naples (for POLAD); CINCLANT, Norfolk (for POLAD); EUCOM for POLAD; USAFE, Wiesbaden, (For POLAD); USAREUR, Heidelberg (for POLAD) CINCSTRIKE, Tampa (for POLAD)

STOUTCARD FOR-3

FROM : Department of State

DATE: MAY 7 11 24 AM '68

SUBJECT: Congressional Testimony by DOD Officials Regarding SENTINEL ABM

REF : USNATO 2859

4

1. We have not seen story (mentioned in reftel) in the April 30 edition of the International Herald Tribune, based on AP release, on Senate Armed Services Committee testimony by Dr. FOSTER, Director, DDR&E, to the effect that SENTINEL ABM system is also a first step toward an Anti-Soviet shield. Text of April 29 AP release on this subject is set forth in paragraph 5 below.

2. If questioned about AP release you should respond as follows:

"Dr. Foster did not state or in any way imply that SENTINEL ABM deployment is intended as a first step toward an anti-Soviet deployment. In response to questioning by the Senate Armed Services Committee in February, both Secretary McNAMARA and Dr. Foster stated that the SENTINEL deployment 'is consistent with the first phase of a deployment against the Soviet Union'. The point they were making is that if in the future it should become possible to deploy an effective defense against the Soviet Union, the US might well be able to use most of the components currently planned for the SENTINEL system, that is, the long-range radar (PAR), the interceptor radar (MSR), and possibly even the SPARTAN and

CONFIDENTIAL

FOR DEPT. USE ONLY

☐ In ☒ Out

FORM 4-62 DS-323

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/IR
REVIEWED BY
DATE
REASON(S)
TS AUTH.
ENDORSE EXISTING WORKINGS
DECLASSIFIED
RELEASE DENIED
PA OF FOI EXEMPTIONS

Drafted by: OSD/ISA: PJ Tagliabue / EUR/RPM: RDC Collins 5/6/68
Contents and Classification Approved by: EUR/RPM: Eugene V. McAuliffe
Clearances: OSD/ISA: Mr. Wyllie, OSD/ISA: Mr. Niemela, USIA: Mr. Hanson, DDR&E: Mr. Lerch, OSD/PA: Mr. Freeman, P: Mr. Tobey, EUR/P: Mr. Gehron
G/PM - Mr. Sloss ACDA - Er. Graybeal

COPY FLO-PBR

1968 MAY 7 PM 2 01

CONFIDENTIAL

CA-7841

-2-

SPRINT missiles. In their testimony before Congressional Committees (including Senate Armed Services Committee) in February, Secretary McNamara and Dr. Foster both made clear that the purpose of SENTINEL is to limit to very low levels the damage that China might otherwise be able to inflict on the US with missiles in the 1970's; that it is not possible at present to build an ABM defense that would protect US cities against the large and sophisticated Soviet missile forces; and that the US has therefore decided against deployment of an ABM system designed to limit damage against possible Soviet attack. In short, the basic position taken by both Secretary McNamara and Dr. Foster in all their Congressional testimony was that contained in Secretary McNamara's 'Posture Statement' before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the Fiscal Year 1969-73 Defense Program and 1969 Defense Budget (released publicly in January). Secretary Clifford restated this position in his brief remarks on ABM at The Hague NPG meeting. "

3. Relevant portions of the unclassified testimony by Dr. Foster (delivered on February 7) to which the April 29 AP release apparently refers is set forth below:

"Senator Symington. My time is up. I would hope at some point you would explain to us why there was a compromise decided on with respect to anti-ballistic missilery, which apparently had little to do with the possible Soviet danger but a great deal to do with the Chinese problem.

"I have read what has been presented to this committee by other people, but it is still not clear to me. Inasmuch as you are a foremost authority in this field, I would appreciate having your thoughts for the record.

"Dr. Foster. Mr. Chairman, may I make just a small point that I would like to add to the record, if you don't mind, with regard to the ballistic missile defense? As you have indicated, I have felt strongly about it for a good many years, I believe that the action the United States is now taking is all the action the United States can take, whether in an attempt to stop an all-out Soviet attack,

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CA-7841

CONFIDENTIAL

-3-

or whether to provide damage denial against a Chinese ICBM. The decision on what to do, whether it is against China or against the Soviet Union, need not be taken for another year.

"Senator Symington. But if I may say so, the Department of Defense specifically stated it was to protect us from China.

"Dr. Foster. That is correct, sir.

"Senator Symington. It is not to protect us from the Soviets. Are you saying that actually it is the first step that we could take in protection against the Soviets?

"Dr. Foster. The statement that was made by Mr. McNamara, and concurred in by General Wheeler, was that this deployment is consistent with the first phase of a deployment against the Soviet Union.

"I don't recommend the latter because I don't know how to build a system that will do that job. I support Secretary McNamara's position. But General Wheeler, who disagrees with him, believes this should be just the first step, and he supports it.

* * * * *

"Senator Pearson. Is it accurate to say that on each occasion where we had to make a new appraisal as to what the greater than expected threat was, and how to overcome it, fundamentally it was our concept to do this in an offensive way rather than a defensive way?

(sic)

"I see a threat/running through most of this testimony from the Secretary and to a large extent here, where, every time we seek to maintain superiority or an adequate deterrent, we do this in an offensive way.

"Dr. Foster. I think that is correct, sir, and it seems to be a simple consequence of the technological situation that we face. It is a fact that the introduction of

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CA-7841

-4-

nuclear explosives enormously increased the effectiveness of the offense over the defense.

"Senator Pearson. Yes

"Dr. Foster. With conventional explosives you can take attack after attack after attack on a city, and the defense can be 90 percent effective or 10 percent effective, and ultimately, if the offense can stand the attrition, the city could be destroyed, but it may take years. In the nuclear game, one attack and the city is gone whether the defense is 90 or 10 percent effective. And we have not been able to think up a defense that will hold up.

"We can think up defenses that will hold up for five or eight or ten warheads, maybe 100, but not hundreds. One will leak through, and only one is necessary to remove the city. So it is just that the contribution made by the nuclear explosive to the offense was much greater than to the defense. So it is not so much a policy as just a straight recognition of the nature of the game.

"Senator Pearson. And the antiballistic missile is really the first deviation from that, isn't it?

"Dr. Foster. The antiballistic missile, using the US third generation technology against the first generation technology of the Chinese looks to us as if for a decade we could have pretty high assurance of damage denial, but not against the Soviets."

4. FOR USNATO: At your discretion, you may draw on the above and on Secretary McNamara's "Posture Statement" in setting the record straight.

5. Following is text of April 29 AP release on anti-ballistic missiles.

"Washington (AP)--The Pentagon's Chief Scientist has provided the first official acknowledgement that the \$5 billion US defense planned against any Red Chinese missiles also is a first step toward an anti-Soviet shield.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CA-7841

-5-

"Dr. John S. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, told the Senate Armed Services Committee the proposed antiballistic missile system, called SENTINEL, could be the foundation for an expanded defense against the Soviets.

"Foster made clear, however, that current US plans and capabilities are only to try to handle the rather rudimentary missiles Red China is expected to have in the early 1970s.

"Former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara told the same group the SENTINEL system was technically capable of intercepting Soviet missiles but only in small numbers.

"As he had repeatedly since last Fall's announcement on the ABM decision, McNamara emphasized the anti-Chinese character of the system.

"Testimony by both men came in Early February but was publicly released only recently."

RUSK

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL